

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6469

ANTHONY JUNIOR BARNHILL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

F. TAYLOR,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan,
District Judge. (5:12-hc-02141-FL)

Submitted: August 21, 2014 Decided: August 25, 2014

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Junior Barnhill, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe
DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh,
North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Junior Barnhill seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Barnhill has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED